DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 259 621 HE 018 502

AUTHOR Bagshaw, Marque
TITLE Managing Resource Uncertainty through Academic Staffing in Four-Year Colleges and Universities. ASHE 1985 Annual Meeting Paper.
INSTITUTION Pennsylvania State Univ., University Park. Center for the Study of Higher Education.
PUB DATE Mar 85
NOTE 38p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education (Chicago, IL, March 15-17, 1985).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; Early Retirement; *Employment Practices; Expenditures; Faculty Evaluation; Financial Problems; Higher Education; Nontenured Faculty; *Part Time Faculty; Personnel Policy; Resource Allocation; *Retrenchment; *Teacher Dismissal; *Tenure; Tenured Faculty
IDENTIFIERS *ASHE Annual Meeting

ABSTRACT

The use of college staffing strategies to reduce staffing expenditures, to reallocate staffing resources, or to limit the time committment of resources to a position is discussed, based on the literature and data from the Project on Reallocation in Higher Education. Control of the decision to create a position or hire replacements for departing faculty is one of the most common ways to control or reduce the number of faculty. The use of part-time faculty is the most prevalent alternative to traditional tenure-track staffing. Findings of the Project on Reallocation survey include: about 57 percent of full-time faculty members are tenured at four-year institutions; almost 30 percent of full-timers are untenured but on tenure tracks; on the average, about 1 in 12 full-time faculty members at tenure-awarding schools are on a non-tenure-track appointment; almost 30 percent of the sample of four-year tenure-awarding schools have established tenure quotas; of 299 colleges awarding tenure, 30 have retrenched at least one tenured faculty member; about 51 percent of schools with tenure systems sytematically review all tenured faculty; and about 50 percent of the schools have either formal or informal early retirement provisions. Data are provided on the number of schools using each staffing practice and the number of faculty members affected. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED259621

MANAGING RESOURCE UNCERTAINTY THROUGH ACADEMIC STAFFING IN FOUR-YEAR COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

A Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the
Association for the Study of Higher Education (ASHE)
Chicago, Illinois, March 16, 1985

Marque Bagshaw

Executive Assistant to the President
Clark University

©1985

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Marque Bagshaw

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

HE018502

ASHE Association for the Study of Higher Education
The George Washington University/One Dupont Circle, Suite 630/Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 296-2597

This paper was presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education held at the Palmer House Hotel in Chicago, Illinois, March 15-17, 1985. This paper was reviewed by ASHE and was judged to be of high quality and of interest to others concerned with the research of higher education. It has therefore been selected to be included in the ERIC collection of ASHE conference papers.

MANAGING RESOURCE UNCERTAINTY THROUGH ACADEMIC STAFFING IN FOUR-YEAR COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES[1]

Marque Bagshaw

Executive Assistant to the President
Clark University

The argument of this paper is that four-year colleges and universities that have departed from traditional tenure-track staffing are not primarily engaged in the process of managing decline but are engaged in the process of managing uncertainty about resources. Because the greater part of an institution's operating budget expenditures is committed to salaries, wages, and fringe benefits paid to academic staff and supporting personnel, academic areas present opportunities for the institution to use staffing practices that reduce the absolute size or rate of growth of budget expenditures, or that limit the length of time budgetary resources must be committed to particular purposes and positions. The use of these practices provides a degree of flexibility or "liquidity" whereby institutional expenditures can be reduced or institutional resources can be redirected quickly should a need arise. This paper examines the extent to which the use of such staffing practices is occurring among four-year colleges and universities.

---

[1]The research on which this paper is based was carried out at The Pennsylvania State University under the auspices of the Center for the Study of Higher Education. I wish to thank Professor Kenneth P. Mortimer, Director of the Project on Reallocation in Higher Education, for permission to use the Project's data, and to acknowledge the useful suggestions of three anonymous reviewers of an earlier version of this work.

Many of the findings and observations reported here derive directly from the analysis of data gathered by the Project on Reallocation in Higher Education, a national study of the methods and extent of institutional efforts to reallocate resources. The project was directed by Professor Kenneth P. Mortimer at Penn State and received financial support from the Lilly Endowment, the Exxon Educational Foundation, and TIAA/CREF.

Since 1982, the Project on Reallocation has gathered information on reallocation, reduction, and the prevailing faculty staffing practices at four-year colleges and universities. The project reviewed published and fugitive literature on academic staffing and reallocation, conducted site visits at nine institutions, and interviewed the chief academic officers or their designates at 318 respondent institutions in a telephone survey of 369 randomly selected four-year colleges and universities in the United States (an 86 percent response rate). Interview data were matched with other institutional information, such as enrollment history, Carnegie classification, and type of control. The 318 institutions which provided data for the project survey represent slightly more than 23 percent of the population of U.S. four-year colleges and universities, exclusive of professional schools and other specialized institutions.

Thus, the data supporting these observations include observations from both the national and campus-based perspectives, a rather comprehensive literature review, and other studies of institutional adaptations. [See Bagshaw, 1984; Johnson and Mortimer, 1977; Mortimer, 1981; Mortimer, Bagshaw, and Caruso, 1985; Mortimer, Bagshaw, and Masland, forthcoming; Mortimer and Ladd, ~~1980~~ 1981; Mortimer and Taylor, 1984; Mortimer and Tierney, 1979.]

The Institutional Context

Enrollment Experience

In 1980, the Carnegie Council (1980) reported that between 1970 and 1979 most institutions of higher education (59%) actually had gained full-time-equivalent (FTE) enrollment. Only 29 percent of all institutions had lost enrollment. The remainder--roughly 12 percent--stayed more or less the same (p. 10). As shown in Table 1, the Project on Reallocation found the enrollment situation among four-year colleges and universities even more favorable: enrollment growth was the dominant experience of four-year colleges and universities over the ten-year period 1972-1981. About 69 percent of respondent institutions had enrollment increases of five percent or more (enrollment "gainers"); only 20 percent of institutions had experienced enrollment decreases of five percent or more (enrollment "decliners"). About 11 percent of respondent institutions had enrollment decreases or increases of less than five percent during the ten-year period ("stable-enrollment" institutions). As seen in Table 1, a significantly larger percentage of research universities and doctorate-granting institutions were enrollment gainers (81 percent), and a significantly larger percentage of liberal arts colleges (28 percent) experienced enrollment decline.

Declaration of Financial Exigency and Retrenchment

If a large number of institutions were experiencing catastrophic decline in resources, we would expect to find a large number of catastrophic institutional responses, such as a large number of institutions declaring financial exigency and substantial numbers of retrenched faculty. Twenty-six or only 8.2 percent of sample institutions in the Project on Reallocation survey reported having declared financial exigency between 1977 and 1982. [Seventeen of these 26

TABLE 1

FTE ENROLLMENT CHANGE, FALL 1972 to FALL 1981*
BY CARNEGIE CLASSIFICATION
(Carnegie Council, 1976)

	Carnegie Classification	Growth N	Growth %	Stable N	Stable %	Decline N	Decline %
1.0	Research and Doctorate-Granting Universities	34	81	3	7	5	12
2.0	Comprehensive Universities and Colleges	101	74	15	11	21	15
3.0	Liberal Arts Colleges	80	60	16	12	37	28
	TOTALS**	215	69%	34	11%	63	20%

* Change is defined as at least 5% growth or decline in FTE enrollment.
** Six of our 318 institutions did not exist in 1972.

institutions (65.4%) were liberal arts colleges, eight (30.8%) were comprehensive institutions, and one (3.8%) was a doctorate-granting institution.]

As shown in Table 2, 52 institutions, or about 16 percent of the 318 four-year colleges and universities in the Project on Reallocation sample, had retrenched at least one faculty member between 1977 and 1982.[2] There were no statistically significant differences among retrenching institutions on the basis of Carnegie classification or type of control. The total number of faculty members retrenched by these 52 institutions between 1977 and 1982 was 453. If one takes this number and extrapolates to the population of four-year colleges and universities, this suggests that approximately 1,948 faculty members were retrenched between 1977 and 1982. That number represents substantially less than one percent of total headcount faculty employed by four-year colleges and universities during any year of this five-year period.

One implication of these enrollment, exigency, and retrenchment data is that, as of 1981-82, managing severe decline had not been a fact of life for most four-year colleges and universities or for most of the professors they employ. The dominant focus of most institutions' activities was dealing with uncertainty about resources. This situation derives from a combination of demographic and economic conditions, and <u>projected</u> conditions, that have been discussed frequently in the literature (e.g., Carnegie Council, 1980; Mortimer and Tierney, 1979; Stadtman, 1980) and that have different implications for different institutions. Since the documentation of these conditions have become a familiar litany, I shall only mention the major ones in passing:

1. Smaller numbers of potential college attenders in the traditional college-age population, with the possibility of offsetting enrollments from nontraditional clienteles. No institution is certain how it will be affected.

---

[2]Retrenchment is defined as "dismissal (including layoff) of tenured faculty members, or dismissal (including layoff) of non-tenured faculty members in mid-contract, for reasons other than just cause or medical reasons."

TABLE 2

RETRENCHMENT OF FACULTY BY CARNEGIE CLASSIFICATION AND BY TYPE OF CONTROL[1]

1977-1981

(n = 318)

CARNEGIE CLASSIFICATION
(Carnegie Council, 1976)

RETRENCHMENT OF FACULTY	Research and Doctorate-Granting Universities	Comprehensive Universities and Colleges	Liberal Arts Colleges	ROW TOTAL
Faculty Retrenched	4 (7.7%) (9.5%)	22 (42.3%) (15.6%)	26 (50.0%) (19.3%)	52 (16.4%)
No Faculty Retrenched	38 (14.3%) (90.5%)	119 (44.7%) (84.4%)	109 (41.0%) (80.7%)	266 (83.6%)
COLUMN TOTAL	42 (13.2%)	141 (44.3%)	135 (42.5%)	318 (100.0%)

X^2 = 2.32368, 2 df; p = 0.3129; Cramer's V = 0.08548

TYPE OF CONTROL

RETRENCHMENT OF FACULTY	Private	Public	ROW TOTAL
Faculty Retrenched	30 (57.7%) (15.0%)	22 (42.3%) (18.6%)	52 (16.4%)
No Faculty Retrenched	170 (63.9%) (85.0%)	96 (36.1%) (81.4%)	266 (83.6%)
COLUMN TOTAL	200 (62.9%)	118 (37.1%)	318 (100.0%)

X^2 (with Yates' Correction) = 0.47870, 1 df; p = 0.4890; Phi = 0.04760

[1]Percentages shown parenthetically to the right of cell frequencies are row percentages; percentages shown parenthetically below cell frequencies are column percentages. Percentages may not sum exactly to 100.0 due to rounding error.

2. Uncertain federal support for the general and educational purposes of institutions, for research, and for student financial aid

3. Uncertainty in the rate of growth of state appropriations

4. Uncertainty in the rate of real-dollar growth of private giving

5. Uncertainty concerning continuing inflation

6. Uncertainty over future shifts in student course preferences and career choices.

These uncertainties are combined with other conditions that are certainties:

1. The increased costs of operating and maintaining classrooms, dormitories, and other physical plant, fuel and utilities, telecommunications, libraries and computing services, laboratories, and research equipment;

2. Increased accountability costs in the form of record-keeping functions and support personnel to deal with government agencies and comply with mandated programs;

3. The increased costs of an aging and relatively immobile faculty that need not retire till age 70.

Institutional Coping Strategies

Under these conditions, institutions that seek to prepare for the contingencies of resource decline have only a limited number of options:

1. To develop strategies for generating additional revenues;

2. To develop strategies for reducing expenditures or reducing the rate of expenditure growth;

3. To develop strategies for reallocating resources internally in order to convert revenues more efficiently in producing institutional "goods and services"; or

4. To develop strategies that do all of the above.

Because faculty and supporting staff salaries, wages, and fringe benefits constitute the major part of an institution's operating budget expenditures (Mortimer and Tierney, 1979, p. 35; Taylor, 1984, p. 67), important opportunities for reducing expenditures and for reducing expenditure growth lie in the area of academic staffing.

Tenure commitments appear to present the primary impediment to reducing budget expenditures by decreasing the number of faculty. Tenure commitments represent long-term commitments of expenditures in the form of salaries and benefits. These commitments are reinforced by strong professional, traditional, and ethical norms that are difficult to quantify. In the aggregate, the strength of an institution's tenure commitments represents one of the major limits on its capacity to reduce expenditures and to reallocate funds internally. According to Cha (1984) a decision to tenure a thirty-five-year-old faculty member probably will cost more than $1 million by the time the faculty member retires.

Internal reallocation of funds is a main source of flexibility for institutions when revenue growth declines (Carnegie Council, 1975, p. 87; Shapiro, 1978, p. 21). This is largely because funds are a liquid resource. Tenured faculty members are a relatively illiquid resource: they cannot be divested or reallocated easily. A tenured professor of classics with fifteen years of service cannot be converted efficiently into an entry-level part-time instructor in computer science. Nevertheless, some institutions have converted underutilized tenured faculty members in areas of low student demand to more productive resources through faculty exchange programs or by retraining faculty for new assignments.

Staffing practices that reduce the absolute size of budget expenditures by reducing the number of faculty include collapsing (not filling) vacant positions, retrenchment of faculty, and providing incentives for early retirement by faculty members. Practices that sidestep the issue of removing faculty but that reduce the rate of growth in budget expenditures or that limit the length of time resource must be committed to an academic position include use of part-time and non-tenure-track appointments, implementation of tenure quotas, and tougher enforcement of tenure and promotion criteria. Practices that turn underutilized

faculty members to more productive use include faculty exchange and retraining programs.

The employment of a faculty member can be viewed as a continuum stretching from the decision to create a position and appointing someone to fill it, through the stages of evaluation and reward of performance in the position, to the termination or retirement of the faculty member or the position. Within this continuum occur four major opportunities to enact staffing strategies designed to reduce expenditures, to limit the length of time resources must be committed to a position, or to reallocate staffing resources:

1. The opportunity to control the decision to create a position or hire replacements for faculty leaving the institution (position control);
2. The opportunity to control the decision of what type of appointment is made (conversion to no-tenure systems; use of nontenure tracks and part-time appointments);
3. The opportunity to reduce the rate of tenure-track faculty receiving tenure (tenure quotas, extended probationary periods, suspension of the "up-or-out" rule, stricter standards for tenure award);
4. The opportunity to increase the number of tenured faculty leaving the institution (post-tenure performance review, incentive early retirement, retrenchment) or to convert underutilized tenured faculty to more productive use (faculty exchange, faculty retraining programs).

The following discussion of the extent to which such practices are used by four-year colleges and universities is organized to parallel this developmental pattern of the employment relationship.

Staffing Practices in Four-Year Colleges and Universities

Collapsing Vacant Positions

Although the Project on Reallocation did not collect survey data on the frequency of the practice, interviews conducted by project staff and the literature support the conclusion that control of the decision to create a position or hire replacements for faculty leaving the institution is one of the most common ways to control or reduce the number of faculty (Dougherty, 1980a, 1980b, 1980c; Mortimer, Caruso, and Ritchey, 1982; Sprenger and Schultz, 1974). When an incumbent faculty member leaves, the position simply can be erased.

The critical question in position control is, who ultimately has the authority to collapse, fill, or create a position? In the Project on Reallocation survey, respondents were asked, "In the case of a full-time faculty vacancy, whose approval must be gained before the position can be refilled?" Almost 85 percent of respondents replied that the campus administration's approval was necessary; about 11 percent replied that the approval of the dean of the academic college, school, or division was required. Less than two percent of respondents said the decision was made at the department level. This distribution of responses suggests a strong tendency toward central control of vacant full-time positions and the creation of new positions. While this tendency may represent good fiscal management in the face of the prospect of external resource scarcity, it may also represent a response to internal stimuli: In some institutions in the Project on Reallocation survey, the decision to create a tenure-track position had become in (literally) nine out of ten cases a de facto commitment to tenure for the person hired.

Not filling a position when the incumbent vacates not only brings about immediate savings that can be reallocated elsewhere but is probably the least likely of the ways of reducing the number of faculty positions to arouse signi-

ficant opposition for faculty. No continuing faculty member's job is sacrificed.

Fixed-Term Contracts: Non-Tenure-Awarding Institutions; Non-Tenure-Track and Part-Time Appointments

The second opportunity for reducing expenditures or reallocating staffing resources is the opportunity to control the decision of what type of appointment is made. Table 3 shows the extent to which institutions in the Project on Reallocation survey had availed themselves of this opportunity. Three things are immediately apparent in Table 3. First, traditional tenure remains firmly in place. About 57 percent of full-time faculty members are tenured at four-year colleges and universities, and almost 30 percent of full-timers are untenured but on tenure tracks. Ninety-four percent (n = 299) of the 318 respondent institutions in the Project on Reallocation survey had tenure systems. Only 6 percent (n = 19) of respondent institutions had no tenure system but appointed all faculty to fixed-term contracts or some form of open-ended agreement.

Secondly, almost 13 percent of full-time faculty in four-year colleges and universities are not tenured or on a tenure track. Slightly more than one percent of all full-time faculty members are at institutions that do not award tenure; about 11.5 percent of full-time faculty members are on non-tenure-track appointments at tenure-awarding institutions. In the Project on Reallocation survey, slightly less than two-thirds (65.1%) of four-year colleges and universities with tenure systems appointed full-time non-tenure-track faculty. On the average, about one in twelve full-time faculty members at tenure-awarding institutions was a non-tenure-track appointment.

The third thing that is immediately apparent from Table 3 is that use of part-time faculty is by far the most prevalent staffing alternative to traditional tenure-track staffing. Over 25 percent of all faculty members at four-

TABLE 3

PROJECT ON REALLOCATION
FACULTY (HEADCOUNT)--FALL 1981
FOUR-YEAR COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES[1]

Response from Sample Institutions (n = 318)

		Full-Time N	Full-Time %	Part-Time N	Part-Time %	Total
Tenured	N	49,012	98.8	588	1.2	49,600
	%	57.42		2.0		43.5
Tenure-Track	N	25,509	98.5	389	1.5	25,898
	%	29.88		1.3		22.7
Other*	N	10,843	28.1	27,750	71.9	3,859
	%	12.7		96.6		33.8
TOTALS		85,364	74.8	28,727	25.2	114,091
		100.00		100.00		100.00

National Estimate (X 4.3)** (N = 1371)

	Full-Time	Part-Time	Total
Tenured	210,752	2,528	213,280
Tenure-Track	109,689	1,673	111,362
Other*	46,625	119,325	165,950
TOTALS	367,066	123,526	490,592

[1]This population excludes professional schools and other specialized institutions in Carnegie Classification 5.0 (Carnegie Council, 1976).

*"Other" includes both faculty on appointments at institutions that do not award tenure and faculty on non-tenure-track appointments at tenure-awarding institutions.

**Responses from sample institutions (which represent slightly more than 23 percent of the total number of four-year colleges and universities in the U.S.) times a factor of 4.3.

year colleges and universities are part-timers. In the Project on Reallocation survey, about 93 percent (n = 294) of respondent institutions reported employing part-time faculty.

Two common rationales for employing part-time faculty are economy and flexibility. In Part-Time Faculty in American Higher Education, Leslie, Kellams, and Gunne (1982) report that by employing part-timers many institutions are able to generate many more student credit hours for fewer dollars than would be needed if a full-time faculty member assumed the same teaching load. Not only are salary costs lower, but in many cases part-timers need not be paid extra-salary employee benefits--a fact well appreciated by enterprising department heads. Increased flexibility results both from avoiding long-term tenure commitments in staffing the position (the institution's commitment to the part-timer ends when his or her contract expires) and from the ability to easily change course offering and academic programs to follow market demand.

There is considerable variation by institutional type in the use of part-time and non-tenure-track appointments. This is shown in Table 4. The top half of the table shows the mean proportion of part-time faculty at institutions in the Project on Reallocation survey according to different Carnegie classifications. On the average, research universities make the least use of part-time appointments, and comprehensive institutions and the Liberal Arts II institutions make the most use of part-timers.

These differences lead one to speculate whether differences in the rate of use of part-timers may relate to differences in institutional mission or faculty function--specifically, a (presumed) greater emphasis on the role of classroom instruction at Comprehensive and Liberal Arts II institutions, a (presumed) greater emphasis on scholarship and research at research universities and Liberal Arts I institutions, and a (presumed) greater emphasis on faculty interactions with students outside the classroom at Liberal Arts I institutions.

TABLE 4

USE OF PART-TIME AND (FULL-TIME) NON-TENURE-TRACK APPOINTMENTS BY CARNEGIE CLASSIFICATION
(Carnegie Council, 1976)

A. USE OF PART-TIME APPOINTMENTS (n = 318)

Carnegie Classification	Number of Institutions	Mean Proportion of Headcount Faculty that is Part-Time
1.1 & 1.2 Research Universities I & II	18	0.124
1.3 & 1.4 Doctorate-Granting Universities I & II	24	0.211
2.1 Comprehensive Universities and Colleges I	95	0.281
2.2 Comprehensive Universities and Colleges II	46	0.243
3.1 Liberal Arts Colleges I	24	0.190
3.2 Liberal Arts Colleges II	111	0.284
TOTAL	318	0.252

B. USE OF (FULL-TIME) NON-TENURE-TRACK APPOINTMENTS (n = 299)

Carnegie Classification	Number of Institutions	Mean Proportion of Full-Time Faculty that is Non-Tenure-Track
1.1 & 1.2 Research Universities I & II	18	0.176
1.3 & 1.4 Doctorate-Granting Universities I & II	23	0.089
2.1 Comprehensive Universities and Colleges I	93	0.081
2.2 Comprehensive Universities and Colleges II	45	0.068
3.1 Liberal Arts Colleges I	24	0.078
3.2 Liberal Arts Colleges II	96	0.070
TOTAL	299	0.082

Leslie et al. (1982) report that the primary functions of part-time faculty at almost all institutions are in classroom-related activities (p. 21). They conclude that if direct classroom service is the sole or principal function of the institution, then part-time faculty are an attractive and inexpensive staffing alternative and are frequently used; if the mission is primarily research and scholarship, then part-timers, because of their "marginal involvement and lesser commitment, contribute little or nothing to the institution's main activity and will be used infrequently" (pp. 30-31).

Leslie et al. (1982) also point out that since most part-timers perform only classroom-related activities, they do not have extensive student contact outside the classroom, do not participate greatly in student advising, and do not contribute much to the extracurricular intellectual life of the institution (p. 5). One implication of this observation is that at institutions where the extracurriculm is considered to be an integral part of student development, these characteristics of part-timers may militate against their extensive use.

To these reflections one should add that the common practice of using graduate students in classrooom instruction at research and doctorate-granting institutions also may contribute to lower proportions of part-time faculty in these types of institutions. In any case, it is not possible to document any of these speculation from the project data.

The lower part of Table 4 shows the mean proportion of full-time faculty that is non-tenure-track at tenure-awarding institutions in the Project on Reallocation survey, arrayed according to Carnegie classification. It is apparent that the heaviest users of full-time non-tenure-track faculty are the research universities, where, on the average, more than one in six full-time faculty members is on a non-tenure-track appointment.

The use of non-tenure-track appointments shares with part-time appointments the benefit to the institution of reducing commitments of resources to tenured positions but differs in removing many of the problems associated with "marginal involvement" by making faculty appointments that are full-time positions. It may be that (as in the case of using part-timers) differences in the level of use of non-tenure-track appointments by institutional type may be accounted for partially by differences in institutional mission or faculty function. If this is true, we would then expect to find, particularly at research universities, the largest number of non-tenure-track full-time faculty engaged in research-related activities, serving as replacements for faculty on leave to conduct research, or serving as visiting research professors.

A second plausible explanation for higher levels of non-tenure-track appointments at research universities is that their high prestige and reputation for superior research facilities and stimulating colleagues may place them in a stronger competitive position in attracting promising younger faculty, allowing these institutions to use non-tenure-track appointments where other institutions would have to offer tenured or tenure-track positions. Neither of these speculations can be documented from the project data.

Tenure Quotas and Stricter Standards for Tenure Award

A third opportunity to reduce expenditures, reallocate resources, and limit the long-term commitment of resources to tenure commitments is to reduce the rate or number of tenure-track faculty who receive tenure. The Project on Reallocation collected data on the use of two related practices: the use of tenure quotas and the application of stricter standards for tenure award. [Other practices related to reducing the rate of tenure award, such as extended probationary periods and suspension of the "up-or-out" rule have been treated extensively by Chait and Ford (1982).]

A tenure quota places an upper limit on the number or percentage of faculty who may hold tenure at an institution or in a department at any one time. In 1972, only about six percent of all institutions had some form of tenure quota (Commission on Academic Tenure, 1973). Chait and Ford (1982) report that between 1972 and 1974 the proportion of institutions with an upper limit on tenure levels increased from 5.9 percent to 9.3 percent (p. 120). The Project on Reallocation found that in 1981-82 almost 30 percent (n = 88) of four-year colleges and universities with tenure systems had established tenure quotas. About 10 percent (n = 31) of respondent institutions reported that they had established quotas for particular academic units. Of the 88 institutions reporting quotas, 37 (42%) had absolute percentage limits and 51 (58%) characterized their quotas as "informal guidelines." The mean tenure quota percentage was 66 percent. The response range was bimodal, equal numbers of institutions indicating quota percentages of 60 and 70 percent. The project found no statistically significant relationship between establishing a tenure quota and institutional type, public or private control, or other institutional characteristics.

The difficulty of attaining tenure was perceived to have increased between 1977 and 1982 by more than two-thirds (68.4%; n = 203) of institutional respondents at tenure-awarding institutions in the Project on Reallocation survey. About 61 percent of tenure-awarding respondents (n = 183) attributed this increased tenure attainment difficulty to stricter application of existing tenure criteria or implementation of new, stricter criteria. One respondent characterized the process as one in which the tenured individuals at the institution had "pulled the tenure ladder up behind them, once they were on board." The most common reasons given by respondents for using stricter tenure standards were (1) to improve the institution's quality, and (2) to increase flexibility

in academic programs and personnel. (One must caution that these data are based on the perceptions of change in tenure attainment difficulty and are not based on actual changes over time in the proportion or number of tenure-eligible faculty receiving tenure awards.)

Interviews in the Project on Reallocation study suggest a heightened sense of responsibility for monitoring tenure tracks among chief academic officers, but we can provide no empirical information on its magnitude. Indeed, in light of the perceptual and anecdotal nature of these data, it is possible that more rigorous application of the traditional mechanisms for controlling access to the tenured ranks remains more of a desideratum than an accomplished fact. Atelsek and Gomberg (1980), for example, report that few tenure-track faculty are removed before the tenure decision: In 1978-79, only 1,313 of 56,566 tenure-track faculty (slightly more than two percent) were terminated prior to the tenure decision (p. 16). While pruning unlikely probationary faculty from the tenure track will certainly give institutions more flexibility and is consistent with the generally approved norms of tenure practice, there is yet little hard evidence to indicate that this activity is receiving a very high priority at many institutions.

Post-Tenure Performance Review; Retrenchment of Tenured Faculty; Provision of Early Retirement Incentives

A fourth and final opportunity to reduce expenditures, reallocate resources, and reduce long-term resource commitments to tenured positions is to increase the number of tenured faculty leaving the institution or to convert underutilized tenured faculty to more productive use by retraining them for service in other areas. Staffing practices that have the effect of increasing the number of tenured faculty leaving the institution include post-tenure performance review, retrenchment, and provision of early retirement incentives.

The extent to which post-tenure performance review is used as grounds for dismissal is relatively undocumented in the literature. Perry (1983) notes that both the 19-campus California State University system and the 14-campus Pennsylvania State College and University system have some form of post-tenure review of faculty. The implementation of a new tenure policy at Texas Tech University, whereby tenured professors would be reviewed every five years with possible termination for unsatisfactory performance, has drawn national attention (Heller, 1984). The American Association of University Professors (AAUP) has not yet taken an official position on post-tenure review (Perry, 1983, p. 27), although the Associate General Secretary of the AAUP, Jordan Kurland in a recent letter to the Chronicle of Higher Education (February 13, 1985) states the Association finds objectionable "the notion of an overlay of a formal system of periodic evaluation on the procedures [for post-tenure review] that already exist" (p. 48). Both the National Education Association (NEA) and the American Federation of Teachers (AFT), while not opposed to performance evaluation for purposes of improving faculty performance, oppose review systems that can be used to revoke a faculty member's tenure (Perry, 1983, p. 27).

Slightly more than half (51.1%; n = 154) of the four-year colleges and universities with tenure systems in the Project on Reallocation survey reported systematically reviewing all tenured faculty. However, less than seven percent of institutions that conducted post-tenure reviews (about three percent of total respondent institutions with tenure systems) reported that negative results of reviews could be used to terminate tenured faculty.

The chief practical drawbacks for institutions in removing tenured faculty as a result of post-tenure review are (1) the practice is not commonly employed by institutions and consequently is likely to encounter the same skepticism and resistance that meets any radical innovation in higher education; (2) the prac-

tice directly affects the job security of tenured faculty and is likely to be opposed for that reason; (3) dismissal of individual tenured faculty members on performance-related grounds will require the institution to specify and document what constitutes adequate and inadequate performance, provide opportunities for remediation, and observe due process.

There is a further, nonpractical drawback to using post-tenure review to remove faculty, and that is the ethical dissonance that may be experienced when post-tenure review is carried out with the ostensible intent of enabling faculty to improve their performance but the evidence of the need to improve oerformance is used as grounds for termination. It is not clear that one process can be used successfully to realize both improvement and reductions.

Earlier in this paper I reported that about 16 percent of respondent institutions in the Project on Reallocation survey had retrenched faculty between 1977 and 1982. Of 299 tenure-awarding institutions in the project sample, 30 (10.0%) had retrenched at least one tenured faculty member. The total number of tenured faculty retrenched by these 30 institutions was 192, suggesting a national estimate of about 826 tenured retrenchees during the five-year period. The 192 tenured retrenchees represent about one-half of one percent of total tenured faculty at all respondent institutions in Fall 1981.

The Project on Reallocation data suggest that the ratio of tenured retrenchees to total retrenched faculty is about the same as the ratio of tenured faculty to total faculty members. In Fall 1981 tenured faculty represented 43.5 percent of total headcount faculty (see Table 3); tenured retrenchees represented 42.4 percent of all faculty retrenched between 1977 and 1982. One can infer from these figures that, overall, tenured faculty members have not been systematically singled out for retrenchment, and that, conversely, they have not been accorded any privileges when retrenchments are carried out.

Indeed, the Project on Reallocation data suggest that retrenchment is being conducted on grounds apparently unrelated to tenure status: Of the slightly more than 16 percent of four-year colleges and universities that reported retrenching faculty, about half cited program closure, program reductions, and enrollment decline as specific reasons for retrenching faculty, and about 13 percent gave financial exigency as the primary reasons for retrenchments. It also may be that the dismissal of tenured faculty for the purpose of freeing up resources and gaining additional staffing flexibility may be too cavalier for most institutions to countenance.

MacDonald (1980) defines an incentive early retirement arrangement as "any arrangement based on a mutual understanding and agreement between the employee and employer to provide a tangible inducement in the form of a monetary or in kind reward for early retirement" (p. 3). Mitchell (1981) concludes that "while early retirement may be a much-talked-about topic in higher education, there is little solid empirical published work on early retirement for academics" (p. 45). She reports that in a survey of faculty over age 45 in the Oregon State System of Higher Education, responses indicated that the three most important conditions that faculty though would allow them to retire early were additional pay, insurance, and part-time employment. Patton (1976) and Ladd and Lipset (1977) both found that larger retirement benefits were the greatest incentive to early retirement, with part-time employment second.

Jenny (1974) and Patton (1979, 1983) identify five basic types of early retirement incentives: early retirement benefit payments that are larger than actuarial tables would justify; lump-sum severance payments; annuity enhancements that increase early retirement income to the amount the employee would have received at normal retirement age; phased retirement or part-time employment; and continuation of fringe benefits.

The Project on Reallocation survey found that about one-half of four-year colleges and universities engage in no early retirement planning with their faculty. Slightly less than 30 percent (n = 93) of surveyed institutions reported having a formal early retirement policy, and slightly less than 20 percent (n = 67) reported negotiating early retirements with individual faculty on an informal basis.

About 37 percent (n = 111) of tenure-awarding institutions offered incentives for faculty to retire early, and about 38 percent (n = 112) had had faculty elect early retirement during the past year. These 112 institutions reported a total 462 faculty electing early retirement in 1981-82. On the basis of these numbers one can estimate the number of early retirements among four-year colleges and universities in 1981-82 as roughly two thousand (1,987).

With regard to types of incentives provided, 17 (15.3%) of the 111 institutions offering incentives provided retirement income supplements only, 14 (12.6%) continued employee benefits after retirement as the sole incentive, 9 (8.1%) offered reduced teaching loads only, 54 (48.6%) offered a combination of the above incentives, and 17 (15.3%) reported "other incentives."

Research and doctorate-granting universities and comprehensive institutions were more likely to provide incentives for faculty to retire early than were liberal arts colleges. Similarly, institutions at which faculty actually had elected early retirement were more likely to be research and doctorate-granting universities and comprehensive institutions than liberal arts colleges. That the same types of institutions were both more likely to provide incentives and to have faculty elect early retirement tends to support the literature which suggests that provision of incentives is the key to increasing early retirements (e.g., Ladd and Lipset, 1977; Mitchell, 1981; Patton, 1976, 1983). With the

exception of research universities, these types of institutions (doctorate-granting universities, comprehensive universities and colleges) also are likely to have higher tenure proportions than other types of institutions and therefore may have more reason to provide early retirement incentives than liberal arts colleges. It is tempting to speculate that provision of incentives at research universities may be motivated to a greater degree by the desire to ease out senior faculty who have become unproductive researchers or who have become disenchanted with their work, in order to make room for more vital researchers. This outcome could be beneficial both to the institution and to the disaffected faculty member.

Hopkins 1972) concludes that providing incentives for faculty to retire early is a short-term strategy for depopulating tenured ranks, a strategy that is not particularly effective as a means of increasing new entry-level appointments. Patton (1979) points out, moreover, that few institutions would want to spend money on a program that caused their most effective teachers and researchers to leave, and that, therefore, most of the early retirement schemes in both business and academe are intended to encourage marginal employees to terminate early. He reports that in a University of California study salary levels and publication rates were negatively associated with willingness to retire earlier than planned when age and length of service were controlled.

The actual costs of incentive early retirement programs are difficult to determine and depend on local factors, as well as such issues as whether early retirees must be replaced, at what rank they must be replaced, and what groups of employees will be given the option to participate. Consideration of these issues will need to take into account the effects on institutional budgets and planning models of the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, which, as of

July 1, 1982, raised the mandatory retirement age in higher education from 65 to 70. It may be that the actual costs of some types of incentive early retirement programs are too high for some institutions. Chait and Ford (1982) suggest that, as the 1980s develop, economic considerations may curtail any thought of early retirement on the part of institutions or their faculty (p. 233).

The last staffing practice I wish to report on is the extent to which facutly are being retrained for reassignment to other academic areas. Only three institutions in the Project on Reallocation survey--less than one percent of all respondents--reported that they had granted paid leave to faculty for the purpose of retraining. However, over 70 percent (n = 230) of respondent institutions reported that they provided opportunities for faculty to retrain, and 17 percent (n = 54) of respondents reported at least one faculty member retraining for new or revised assignment in 1981-82. The total number of faculty members retraining at these 54 institutions was 103. The number represents less than one-tenth of one percent of the total number of faculty members at respondent institutions in the Project of Reallocation survey.

The obvious question is, why so few? Patton (1979) states that the central issue in faculty retraining activity is whether an institution has an incentive to pay for retraining when sufficient trained personnel are available in the marketplace and when retrained personnel may take their new expertise elsewhere. Thus, one explanation for small numbers of faculty retraining may be that there are few incentives for institutions to have faculty retrain.

Summary and Conclusions

Table 5 reviews the staffing practices discussed in the previous section in terms of (1) the number and percentage of four-year colleges and universities using the practice, and (2) the number and percentage of faculty members affected by institutional use of the practice. An attempt has been made to rank practices in the table, with practices having the most extensive use at the top and those with the least extensive use at the bottom.

Although the Project on Reallocation did not collect data on the number of institutions that have collapsed vacant positions, the literature, project site visits, and project interviews suggest that this practice occurs at almost all institutions of higher education, and is one of the first places institutions turn in seeking to reduce expenditures. The following newspaper account of a medium-sized comprehensive institutions recent efforts to reduce expenditures by making staffing cuts is anecdotal but illustrative of a typical pattern:

> . . . Faced with a dwindling student enrollment, [the] University will eliminate 105 paid positions in an effort to save more than $2 million . . . .
>
> Forty-six of the 105 positions are not filled; the remaining 59 are held by 20 faculty members, 26 staff members, and 13 administrative employees.
>
> . . . Most of the [20] faculty positions that will be eliminated are held by professors who are 70 years old and are expected to retire this year, professors in their 60s who are taking early retirement, or faculty members whose requests for tenure have been turned down . . . .
>
> (The Philadephia Inquirer, December 12, 1984)

Of the same situation, the Chronicle of Higher Education (February 6, 1985) reported that 55 of the 105 positions targeted for elimination already were vacant before the cutbacks were announced, and that university officials had said that no current tenured faculty members would be terminated (p.2).

TABLE 5

EXTENT OF USE OF SPECIFIC FACULTY STAFFING PRACTICES BY FOUR-YEAR COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES IN THE PROJECT ON REALLOCATION SURVEY

	Practice	Use By Institutions	Actual Number of Faculty Affected (as of 1981-82)
1.	Collapsing Vacant Positions	No Project Data	--
2.	Tenure-Track Appointments	299 (94.0%)[a]	25,898 (22.7%)[b]
3.	Part-Time Appointments	294 (92.5%)[a]	28,727 (25.2%)[b]
4.	Full-Time Non-Tenure-Track Appointments	194 (64.9%)[c]	9,847 (8.6%)[b]
5.	Stricter Tenure Standards[d]	183 (61.2%)[c]	No Project Data
6.	Provision of Incentives for Early Retirement	111 (37.1%)[c]	
	Faculty Electing Early Retirement in 1981-82	112 (37.5%)[c]	462 (0.9%)[e]
7.	Establishment of Tenure Quotas	88 (29.4%)[c]	No Project Data
8.	Provision of Opportunities to Retrain	230 (72.3%)[a]	
	Faculty Retraining for New or Revised Assignment in 1981-82	54 (17.0%)[a]	103 (0.1%)[b]
9.	Retrenchment of Faculty Between 1977 and 1982	52 (16.4%)[a]	453 (0.4%)[b]
	Retrenchment of Tenured Faculty Between 1977 and 1982	30 (10.0%)[c]	192 (0.3%)[f]
10.	Review of Tenured Faculty with the Possibility of Dismissal for Inadequate Performance	10 (3.3%)[c]	No Project Data

[a] The percentage is based on the total 318 respondent institutions in the sample.

[b] The percentage is based on total headcount faculty at the 318 respondent institutions in the sample in Fall 1981.

[c] The percentage is based on the total 299 tenure-awarding respondent institutions in the sample.

[d] This practice is measured by respondents' perception of reasons for increased tenure attainment difficulty between 1977 and 1982.

[e] The percentage is based on total tenured faculty at the 318 respondent institutions in Fall 1981.

[f] The percentage is based on total tenured and tenure-track faculty at respondent institutions in Fall 1981.

The increased use of part-time faculty is one of the most important changes in the professoriate over the last two decades. Leslie et al. (1982) report that there were 82,000 at both two- and four-year institutions in 1960 and 200,000 in 1977. They estimate that in 1981 there were about 210 to 215 thousand part-timers employed in all American colleges and universities (p. 23). As can be seen in Table 5, not only is the number of institutions making part-time appointments about equal to the number making tenure-track appointments, but the number of faculty on part-time appointments at respondent institutions in Fall 1981 actually exceeded the number of tenure-eligible faculty on tenure tracks.

This trend has caused concern on two grounds. First, there is one of the major findings of the Leslie et al. (1982) study of part-time faculty, namely, that "it is not at all uncommon for institutions to have no count of part-timers and no way to report on the level of part-time employment. Few institutions have considered part-time employment at the policy level. For the most part, we see a free-wheeling department-level allocation of available faculty slots" (p. 143). Interviews conducted by the Project on Reallocation provide some support for this lack of institutional awareness about practices involving part-time faculty. A clear implication of these findings is that if institutions are to use the employment of part-time faculty to increase flexibility, they must coordinate and control the hiring of part-timers. As Gapa (1984) states, "Treating part-time faculty employment as a casual departmental affair instead of a central institutional concern is a mistake. . . . Free-wheeling departmental autonomy (with attendant abuses) should be replaced by central responsibility for part-time faculty to insure fair and humane treatment" (p. 6).

A second ground for concern for some institutions is the effect of using large numbers of part-time faculty on the intellectual environment outside the classroom. In its report Involvement in Learning, the Study Group on the

Conditions of Excellence in American Higher Education (1984) recommends that "academic administrators should consolidate as many part-time teaching lines into full-time positions as possible" (p. 36). The Study Group argues that the full-time faculty member is more likely to identify with the institution and become more intensely involved with students, thus contributing to an institutional environment that encourages student involvement in learning outside the classroom.

Table 5 also shows that full-time non-tenure-track positions are used by about 65 percent of tenure-awarding respondent institutions. About one faculty member in twelve was on a full-time non-tenure-track appointment in 1981-82. This represents a significant proportion of headcount faculty. In some cases there is no question that the hiring of faculty members on non-tenure-track and part-time appointments is motivated by the opportunity to enrich the institutional curriculum with the special expertise of recognized practitioners in (for example) the arts, medicine, law, government, or applied scientific fields. These persons either may not qualify for a tenure-track position, or their professional lives elsewhere may not permit them to accept a full-time position. However, the primary advantage of non-tenure-track, part-time appointments, and fixed-term contracts in general is the opportunity to restrict financial and programmatic commitments (Chait and Ford, 1982, pp. 80-83).

Stricter application of tenure standards is reported at more than 60 percent of tenure-awarding institutions. We have no data to measure the effects of more restrictive tenure standards on the actual number of tenure-eligible faculty that are receiving tenure annually, nor do we have data to measure the change in this number between 1977 and 1982. The same situation occurs with regard to tenure quotas: Although almost 30 percent of tenure-awarding respondent institutions had established tenure quotas, we do not know how many quotas actually have been tested or how many tenure denials have occurred as a result.

Probably the most important implication of the data arrayed in Table 5 is that, as of the academic year 1981-82, the expenditure-reducing and flexiblity-promoting staffing practices most used by institutions, and the largest documented numbers of faculty affected by these types of staffing practices, are at the hiring end of the staffing continuum rather than at the terminating or the retiring end. This suggests that, on the whole, institutions were more involved in making future-oriented staffing decisions directed toward achieving staffing flexibility in order to face uncertain resource environments than in making decisions to terminate their most expensive faculty in order to effect immediate and substantial expenditure reductions. In 1981-82 most four-year colleges and universities were not "behaving" like sinking vessels emperiled by the sea around them, but a large number of them were taking on ballast in preparation for the uncertain voyage ahead.

The only practice with salience at the terminating end of the staffing continuum is early retirement. About 37 percent of tenure-awarding institutions provided incentives for early retirement, and about 38 percent had a total 462 early retirees in 1981-82. [Note that the comparable number of 453 retrenched faculty is for a five-year period.] These 453 early retirees are a small number compared to the number of faculty involved in practices at the hiring end of the scale, but they may represent long-term savings in salaries and benefits--particularly for those retirements that feed back to the hiring end in the form of decisions to collapse the vacated positions.

Recent actions at the State University of New York (SUNY) and the City University of New York (CUNY) may signal an increase in early retirements in coming years. At SUNY, 611 of 2,857 eligible employees (21.4%) elected the early retirement option, of whom 452 (74.0%) were faculty members. At CUNY, 750 of 3,200 eligible employees (23.4%) took the option, including about 18 percent

of the eligible faculty members. According to Ingalls (1985), who reports these figures, officials in both systems cite budgetary constraints and low turnover rates as causes of a "virtual hiring freeze" in recent years (p. 27).

In concluding, I wish to make five brief observations:

1. Traditional tenure-track staffing remains firmly in place. Ninety-four percent of four-year colleges and universities have tenure systems; about 57 percent of all full-time faculty at four-year colleges and universities have tenure.

2. Most four-year colleges and universities have not experienced catastrophic erosion in their traditional resource bases, and most have not attempted catastrophic interventions in the way of staffing practices. Only 20 percent of four-year colleges and universities experienced enrollment declines of five percent or more over the ten-year period 1972-1981; only about 8 percent had declared financial exigency between 1977 and 1982, and only about 16 percent had retrenched any faculty member between 1977 and 1982. The total number of faculty retrenched during this five-year period represents only four-tenths of one percent of total headcount faculty at respondent institutions in Fall 1981. Tenured and tenure-track faculty members have not been so much sacrificed as "squeezed" by institutional efforts to adapt to uncertain environments.

3. Institutions are making a significant level of use of part-time and non-tenure-track appointments. There are equally significant differences by institutional type in the extent that the practices are used. The differences may relate to the importance of research and scholarship and the importance of faculty/student contact outside the

classroom in the mission of the institution and in the responsibilities of faculty.

4. Many institutions are investing in flexibility-promoting staffing decisions at the hiring end of the staffing continuum as opposed to making staff reduction decisions at the terminating end of the continuum. This suggests greater concern for dealing with uncertainty about resources than concern to reduce expenditures dramatically in the short term.

5. One of the major questions that most four-year colleges and universities will face in the next ten years is not the question of survival but the question of identity: To what extent will the institution be driven by external conditions in preference to internal values? What sleight of mind will be required to recognize the operations carried out by the institution in 1995 as fulfillment of its historic mission in the past?

The lesson here for institutional leaders is that the competing demands on academic personnel systems to provide flexibility and to promote learning and scholarship will require considerable mediation in the individual institutional context.

References

Atelsek, F., and Gomberg, I. Tenure Practices at Four-Year Colleges and Universities. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1980.

Bagshaw, M. "Faculty Staffing Practices at Four-Year Colleges and Universities." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University, 1984.

Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education. Three Thousand Futures: The Next Twenty Years for Higher Education. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1980.

Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education. A Classification of Institutions of Higher Education: Revised Edition. Berkeley, CA, 1976.

Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education. More than Survival: Prospects for Higher Education in a Period of Uncertainty. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1975.

Chait, R. P. "Academic Personnel Policy and Administration." In R.P. Chait and associates, Trustee Responsibility for Academic Affairs, pp. 25-51. Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 1984.

Chait, R. P., and Ford, A. T. Beyond Traditional Tenure: A Guide to Sound Policies and Practices. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1982.

Commission on Academic Tenure in Higher Education ("Keast Commission"). Faculty Tenure: A Report and Recommendations. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1973.

Dougherty, E. A. "What is the Most Effective Way to Handle Program Discontinuances: Case Studies from 10 Campuses." Paper presented at the American Association for Higher Education Conference, Washington, D.C., April 18, 1980a.

Dougherty, E. A. "University of California--Riverside." Unpublished manuscript, University of Michigan, 1980b.

Dougherty, E. A. "University of Wisconsin." Unpublished manuscript, University of Michigan, 1980c.

Gappa, J. M. "Employing Part-Time Faculty: Thoughtful Approaches to Continuing Problems." American Association for Higher Education Bulletin (October 1984): 3-7.

Heller, S. "Growing Pains at Texas Tech: Faculty and President Clash over Tenure." Chronicle of Higher Education 29 (November 21, 1984): 19-22.

Hopkins, D. S. P. An Early Retirement Program for the Stanford Faculty: Report and Recommendations. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University, 1972.

Ingalls, Z. "Early Retirement Option in New York St[illegible]ttracts Hundreds of College Employees." Chronicle of Higher Educa[illegible]9 (January 9, 1985): 27.

Jenny, J. R. Early Retirement, A New Issue in Higher Education: The Financial Consequences of Early Retirement. New York: TIAA, 1974.

Johnson, M. D., and Mortimer, K. P. Faculty Bargaining and the Politics of Retrenchment in the Pennsylvania State Colleges, 1971-1976. University Park, PA: Center for the Study of Higher Education, The Pennsylvania State University, 1977.

Ladd, E. C. Jr., and Lipset, S. M. "Many Professors Would Postpone Retirement if Laws Were Changed." Chronicle of Higher Education 16 (November 7, 1977).

Leslie, D. W., Kellams, S. E., and Gunne, M. G. Part-Time Faculty in American Higher Education. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1982.

MacDonald, P. O. An Appraisal of Early Retirement Programs and Prospects at Penn State." Mimeographed. University Park, PA: Office of Planning and Budget, The Pennsylvania State University, 1980.

Mitchell, B. A. "Faculty Early Retirement: A Planning and Budgeting Issue in Higher Education." In Higher Education Planning and Budgeting: Ideas for the 80's, edited by Melodie Christal. Boulder, CO: National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, 1981.

Mortimer, K. P. "Procedures and Criteria for Faculty Retrenchment." In Challenges of Retrenchment: Strategies for Consolidating Programs, Cutting Costs, and Reallocating Resources, edited by J. Mingle and associates, pp. 153-170. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1981.

Mortimer, K. P., Bagshaw, M., and Caruso, A. Academic Reallocation: A National Profile. University Park, PA: Center for the Study of Higher Education, The Pennsylvania State University, 1985.

Mortimer, K. P., Bagshaw, M., and Masland, A. Flexibility in Academic Staffing. Washington, D.C.: Association for the Study of Higher Education/ERIC Clearinghouse, forthcoming.

Mortimer, K. P., Caruso, A., and Ritchey, T. I. "The Faculty and the Institution: A Question of Context, Terminology, and Linkages." Mimeographed. University Park, PA: Center for the Study of Higher Education, The Pennsylvania State University, 1982.

Mortimer, K. P., and Ladd, E. C. "Faculty." In Higher Education: A Bibliographic Handbook, Volume II, edited by D. K. Halstead, pp. 177-235. Washington, D.C.: The National Institute of Education, 1981.

Mortimer K. P., and Taylor, B. E. "Budgeting Strategies Under Conditions of Decline." In Responding to New Realities and Funding, edited by L. Leslie, pp. 67-86. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1984.

Mortimer, K. P., and Tierney, M. L. The Three R's of the Eighties: Reduction, Reallocation, and Retrenchment. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1979.

Patton, C. V. "Institutional Practices and Faculty Who Leave." In College Faculty: Versatile Human Resources in a Period of Constraint, edited by R. G. Baldwin and R. T. Blackburn, pp. 43-55. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1983.

Patton, C. V. Academia in Transition: Mid-Career Change or Early Retirement. Cambridge, MA: Abt Books, 1979.

Patton, C. V. "Early Retirement in Academia: Making the Decision." The Gerontologist 17(4) (August 1976): 347-354.

Perry, S. "Formal Reviews for Tenured Professors: Useful Spur or Orwellian Mistake?" Chronicle of Higher Education 27 (September 21, 1983): 25-26.

Shapiro, H. T. "Resource Planning and Flexibility." Business Officer (September 1978): 20-23.

Sprenger, J. M., and Schultz, R. E. "Staff Reduction Policies." College Management 9 (1974): 22-23.

Stadtman, V. A. Academic Adaptations: Higher Education Prepares for the 1980s and 1990s. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1980.

Study Group on the Conditions of Excellence in American Higher Education. Involvement in Learning: Realizing the Potential of American Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, 1984.

Taylor, B. E. "Academic Budgets." In R. P. Chait and associates, Trustee Responsibility for Academic Affairs, pp. 67-89. Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 1984.